The No. 1 Mystery of Santo Domingo, Pps. 2-3

This Is Where Our Bankrupt Policy of Bombing North Vietnam Had Its Origins

"Let us assume that, in the fall of 1964, we would have warned the Communists that unless they ceased supporting the guerrillas in South Vietnam, we would destroy a major military supply depot in North Vietnam. Through radio and leaflets, we would have advised the civilian population living near the depot of our ultimatum and of the exact time of our attack so that civilians could be evacuated. If the Communists had failed to heed our warning and continued to support the rebels, we would have gone through with the threatened attack and destroyed the depot. And if this act of 'persuasive deterrence' had not sufficed, we would have threatened the destruction of another critical target and, if necessary, would have destroyed it also. We would have continued this strategy until the Communists had found their support of the rebels in South Vietnam too expensive and agreed to stop it. Thus, WITHIN A FEW DAYS and with minimum force, the conflict in South Vietnam would have been ended in our favor. Beyond this, we would have gained immeasurably in prestige. . . ." (Emphasis added).

—Design for Survival, *by Gen. Thomas S. Power, retired Commander-in-Chief of the Strategic Air Command, a book he was forbidden to publish while in service. The jacket boasts that he "personally led the mission that incinerated 16 sq. miles of Tokyo—history's most devastating air raid" and "literally had his finger on the nuclear trigger during the Cuban missile crisis." The book—and the results of the North Vietnamese bombings—show how simple-minded our top military commanders can be.*

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. XIII, NO. 24 JUNE 21, 1965 101 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Why Not Peace Through Free Elections in South Vietnam?

Senator Fulbright declares "the tragedy of Vietnam" lies in the failure of the United States to appreciate "the power of nationalism in Southeast Asia." The trouble with Senator Fulbright is that he so rarely translates his generalized insights into meaningful policy. The Senator sees our failure in Vietnam arising from "the intransigeance of a colonial power and the initial failure of the U.S. to appreciate the consequences of that intransigeance." As a result, Fulbright said, "the nationalist movement became associated with and largely subordinate to the Communist movement." But the Administration stubbornly persists in the same intransigieant attitude. It will not recognize the nationalist character of the struggle. It will not negotiate with the South Vietnamese National Liberation Front. It insists on treating South Vietnam as a "sovereign nation", the North as an aggressor, the Viet Cong as mere tools of the North. The fact that this *is* a war of national liberation, which began against the Japanese, continued against the French and is now being waged against us, is the primary political fact about the war. But Fulbright nowhere faces up to it.

Fulbright Overlooks the No. 1 Precondition

On the contrary, Fulbright enlists his talents in the defense of the Johnson Administration. He praises Johnson for "steadfastness and statesmanship" in "the goal of ending the war at the earliest possible time by negotiations without preconditions." The Administration's spokesmen have never offered *negotiations* without preconditions. On and off the record, they have stressed that they were only offering *"discussions* without preconditions." The main precondition is that we will not negotiate with the men who actually control most of the country and are doing the fighting. We have shopped around trying to buy some settlement on the cheap from Moscow or Peking, as if the revolt in South Vietnam could be turned off by a spigot from either capital. From the very beginning U.S. policy has refused to recognize the grass roots character of the rebellion. The attempt to suppress it by dictatorship and war explains why, in Fulbright's own words, "the nationalist movement became associated with and largely subordinate to the Communist movement." Our policies gave discontent no other effective channel except joining this Popular Front with the Communists just as our refusal to negotiate with the National Liberation Front gives it no alternative but to carry on the armed struggle with whatever help it can get—and that has been little and late—from the Communist bloc. Yet Fulbright will not bring himself to say so.

In the absence of plain speaking on this basic issue of negotiations with the Viet Cong, Fulbright's speech boils down to apologetics for the new policy of committing combat troops to South Vietnam and fighting out the war on the ground. His whole speech supports the Administration's view that there is no present alternative. The shrewd manip-

(*Continued on Page Four*)

A Phi Beta Kappa "Award" for Bundy

"We, members of Phi Beta Kappa, dissociate ourselves from the honor accorded McGeorge Bundy as this year's convocation Orator. Mr. Bundy has been clearly identified as an architect and defender of American policies in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. Not only do we feel that these policies endanger the peace and threaten the deepest spirit of our republican institutions; we hold, moveover, that by his outspoken contempt for critics, lay and academic, Mr. Bundy has disqualified himself to address a group dedicated to humane inquiry and the strengthening of a free society through honest debate. We deplore the obscurantism and disingenuousness resorted to by Mr. Bundy and other government spokesmen in their efforts to make any opposition appear at best uninformed and at worst wilfully subversive. We have chosen to speak out against a morally deadening consensus in the hope that the democratic ideals and the intellectual honesty that have guided our policies in the past may not continue to be mocked in practice."

—Protest by 100 Phi Beta Kappa key holders at Harvard, June 13.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Murchison Lobbyist Used by State Department in Dominican Talks . . .

In its projected hearings on the Dominican Republic, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee ought to look into a mystery that has the correspondents who have been there puzzled: What happened to the agreement McGeorge Bundy had reached in Santo Domingo with the constitutionalists? Col. Camaano, with the approval of Juan Bosch, had agreed with Bundy on a new government under Antonio Guzman, who was Bosch's Minister of Agriculture. The new government would have operated under the democratically adopted 1963 constitution. This settlement was blocked in Washington on Bundy's return. There is talk instead of Joaquin Balaguer as head of a new government, though he was for 30 years Trujillo's faithful rubber stamp.

Texan Multi-Millionaires

One place to start such an inquiry would be with the role being played in the Dominican affair by I. Irving Davidson, a Washington lobbyist whose $1,000-a-month activities for the Somoza dictatorship in Nicaragua came to light in the 1963 investigation into lobbying by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It turned out that Davidson is also a Washington representative for the Murchisons of Texas, who have interests in Haiti and Nicaragua. Is Davidson acting for them in the Dominican affair?

Walter Pincus, the brilliant young newspaperman who dug up the facts for the lobby investigation, is now employed by the *Washington Star*. In that paper June 9 he disclosed that the Justice Department had asked Davidson to register as an agent for Joaquin Balaguer only to have Davidson claim that he was acting for the State Department in "contacting" Belaguer! A few days earlier John M. Goshko had reported to the *Washington Post* from Santo Domingo (June 6) that "the exiled Balaguer has been mentioned with increasing frequency by State Department officials as a man who might satisfy all parties." It is hard to believe that Balaguer would satisfy anyone but U.S. interests which benefitted from the Trujillo dictatorship, the Trujillo family and the Dominican military who so long served the dead Benefactor.

In the Senate, the day after the *Star's* story was published, Senator Morse put into the Congressional Record the complete transcript of Davidson's interrogation by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee March 8, 1963. The Senate committee found that Davidson boasted to the Somozas that through his friendly relations with Hoffa and the Teamsters Union he could mobilize 12,000 workers in the 1960 presidential campaign. Davidson said he was working to obtain the Republican nomination for Nixon and the Democratic for Lyndon Johnson. He added (see box below) that he had been promised "a general house-cleaning" in the Central American section of the State Department to rid it of elements insufficiently anti-Communist and therefore unfriendly to dictators like the Somozas.

At the time, in 1963, this sounded like the characteristically inflated boasting of a Washington "influence peddler" (as Morse termed him) especially since the slick and evasive

AFL-CIO True to Form in Latin Crisis

In Juan Bosch's book about his overthrow (Crisis de la Democracia de America en la Republica Dominicana: Mexico, 1964), he says the military coup against him was supported by Dominican trade unions the AFL-CIO favors. This anti-Bosch bias is evident in the latest Inter-American Labor Bulletin (June, 1965) issued by ORIT, the Inter-American Regional Labor Organization affiliated with the AFL-CIO. Its editor, Andrew C. McLellan, in a by-line story on the new Dominican upset shares Time Magazine's enthusiasm for Gen. Wessin y Wessin, calling him "one of the few incorruptible top elements in the Dominican army." McLlellan gives him credit for "two notable bloodless coups", in Jan. 1962 against Gen. Echevarria and in Sept. 1963 against Bosch. The editor says Wessin overthrew Bosch because the latter "was unable to control the lawlessness which had enveloped the nation"! The Bulletin supports U.S. armed intervention and deplores the "doctrinaire reaction" it provoked in Latin America. Bosch is criticized for favoring Communists and "hooligans."

Why Nicaraguan Dictator's Lobbyist Supported Johnson for the Nomination in 1960

Letter from I. Irving Davidson to His Excellency, Senor Luis A. Somoza, President of Nicaragua, dated July 7, 1960:

"Dear Luis: Today I am taking off for Los Angeles, for the Democratic Convention where I will be in the active camp of Lyndon Johnson. . . . I am operating behind the scenes. So far as Nicaragua is concerned, everyone with whom I am dealing knows that I am your registered representative, and everyone knows that much of the money I spend throughout the year is made available to me through your generosity. I do have a promise from the LBJ policy board that we will be given first refusal for representations (ambassadorial, military, et al), but more important, there will be a general housecleaning of the policy makers of the State Department for Central America. . . ."

The CHAIRMAN (Fulbright): Did you write that letter?

Mr. DAVIDSON: Yes. This letter looks familiar. . . .

The CHAIRMAN: What do you mean by the active camp of Lyndon Johnson?

Mr. DAVIDSON: Well . . . I thought that Lyndon Johnson was a great liberal . . . and politics has been somewhat of a little hobby with me . . . and I wanted to do everything in my power that a man like Lyndon would get the Democratic nomination because I knew he understood the threat of Communism in the Western Hemisphere. . . .

The CHAIRMAN: Did any one person make a promise to you?

Mr. DAVIDSON: No, not one person, no specific statement.

The CHAIRMAN: Then this statement is false, isn't it?

Mr. DAVIDSON: No, I didn't say any one person: I had a promise from the LBJ policy board. I would say that it would be an assumption I made from my conversations with many people that LBJ's team felt like I did about Central America, about the communistic element . . . they were going to clean house of all these longhairs that were about on Central America. . . .

The CHAIRMAN: Did you ever discuss this with Lyndon Johnson himself?

Mr. DAVIDSON: I did not.

The CHAIRMAN: He made no such promise?

Mr. DAVIDSON: No, he did not. But I was around enough of his aids to know that he thought like I did . . . we ought to have a hard policy on Communism, and these leftwingers in Central and South America.

—Testimony before Fulbright foreign agents inquiry, reprinted in Congressional Record June 10 pps. 12657-79.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

. . . Trujillo's Lifelong Shadow, Balaguer, Being Suggested As New President

Davidson finally admitted he had never discussed this personally with Johnson or had any such promise from his aides.

More Than An Idle Boast?

"I think he was doing his best," Morse told the Senate, "to impress Mr. Somoza with his value as a lobbyist. To what extent his statements about promises from 'the LBJ policy board' were true we did not go into, since in March of 1963, when the hearing was held, Mr. Johnson was not President. But today he is President. And inquiries at the State Department have been reported to me which indicate that the Department is using Mr. Davidson as their contact with Joaquin Balaguer in dickering for a new government for the Dominican Republic."

Morse said that "when the President wanted to dicker with Juan Bosch" he sent former Ambassador John Bartlow Martin. "Surely it is possible," Morse told the Senate, "to find someone equally reputable and free from financial involvement to dicker with Mr. Balaguer."

At the State Department's daily briefing next day, June 11, its press spokesman, Robert McCloskey would not comment on Morse's criticism but admitted that Davidson had been asked by the Department to contact Balaguer. When one newspaperman pointed out that Balaguer had an apartment in New York City and a telephone, McCloskey said it was "considered practical to ask Mr. Davidson to contact him." McCloskey said the Department knew Davidson had been in contact with Balaguer "and could really reach him."

The Foreign Relations Committee ought to inquire how the Department knew Davidson had been in contact with Balaguer. If he had contacted the Department earlier on behalf of Balaguer, or if the Department knew he was acting for Balaguer, then Davidson should have registered the fact under the Foreign Agents Registration Act. Why did the State Department hasten to assure the Justice Department that Davidson was acting on its behalf, not Balaguer's? This saved him from the need to register. It was also as good as money in the bank for a Washington lobbyist anxious to impress other clients, present or potential, with the extent of his influence.

A year after the lobbying investigation, Davidson also figured in the Bobby Baker hearings by the Senate Rules Committee. These showed that he acted as intermediary between the Murchison meat packing interests in Haiti and purchasers in this country. Bobby Baker and his partner, Tucker, got 10 percent of the Murchison meat packing company's profits up to a maximum of $30,000 in one deal. Baker also got $4,000 from the purchaser of the meat in that deal. The problem was to "expedite" inspection under U.S. Department of Agriculture sanitary regulations. The Republican minority report complained that it was blocked in its efforts to find out just what Baker did to earn these fees.

In 1960, when Davidson claimed he tried to help Johnson get the Democratic presidential nomination, Baker was Johnson's right hand man. This was not the only deal in which Davidson figured in the Baker hearings. Baker, too, had close relations with the Murchisons. What happens in the Dominican Republic may affect events in neighboring Haiti, where the aged dictator, Duvalier, is reported to be seriously ailing. To put Balaguer into power in the Dominican Republic would be to set up a new government favorable to the oligarchy and to U.S. capital. Sooner or later, if not from the very start, it would have to be a military dictatorship. Sooner or later, it would also breed a new revolt. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee would perform a public service for both the Dominican people and our own if they threw a spot light on this Davidson affair and headed off a new disaster.

In Defense of the June 14 Movement

We call attention to an article in the May 31 issue of New America, bi-weekly organ of the U.S. Socialist Party (1182 Broadway, NYC, $4 a year) by John Lester Lewine, a member of the party's International Affairs Committee. Lewine was one of the Americans evacuated from Santo Domingo April 27 by the U.S. Navy. Lewine writes that the evacuation was carried out with the consent of both sides and that political intervention was inexcusable.

"As for the Movimiento del 14 de Junio which the U.S. labels as 'Castrolite'," Lewine declares, "it is a left wing socialist movement" which supported Bosch. "Of course," he continues, "it opposed the U.S. policy toward Cuba, and urged a long-term policy of socialization in the Dominican Republic, but its primary concern was the reestablishment of a functioning democracy in the Dominican Republic as an essential pre-requisite for further reforms." The movement takes its name from June 14, 1959, when it tried to overthrow Trujillo.

Even the Papal Nuncio Assailed as A Red in The Witch Hunt Engulfing Dominica

Santo Domingo—The "witch hunt" organized by the junta of General Imbert Barreras now extends to all of the Dominican Republic. . . . The arbitrary arrests made by the police of the junta multiply despite the timid protests of Dr. Mora, Secretary General of the OAS. . . . To take the figures admitted by the junta, there are already more than 2,000 political prisoners in the capital. . . . In the towns of the interior, the police, using blacklists, make house searches and arrests without their reasons always being evident. Thus two imprisoned Spanish subjects have been released thanks to the intervention of the Spanish Ambassador. He telephoned to the chief of the police, 'You are crazy. These two are Franco followers. In any case they are Spanish and I forbid you to touch them.' . . .

This repression is accompanied by a mounting wave of anti-Communist hysteria. The constant denunciation of 'Communist barbarity' by Radio San Isidro takes on a growing violence. The explosion of blind hate is in process of attaining limits hitherto unimaginable. Thus a petition presently being circulated in the zone of security among families of the bourgeoisie demands the departure of the Apostolic Nuncio as "an agent of international communism."

For the men of the junta, the term Communist cannot be very definite since they hurl it with the same furious opprobrium equally at the Christian Social allies of the Dominican Revolutionary Party of Bosch, the United Nations, the Dominican Catholic hierarchy for having suggested a solution of moderation, and even the OAS, which is accused of partiality. At this rate, one can seriously ask if the America of Mr. Johnson will not soon be included in the "Red" list since the Junta has begun to denounce "foreign intervention in the Dominican Republic."

—Marcel Niedergang in Le Monde (Paris) May 30-31.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

McNamara Says Our Only Object In South Vietnam Is To Allow Free Choice

(*Continued from Page One*)

ulators at the White House won quite a victory in getting Fulbright, the idol of the liberals, rather than some Senator like Dodd, their *bête noire*, to deliver this curtain-raiser for the new policy. But even with it, the Administration did not have the honesty to talk frankly to the American people about the real cost. Secretary McNamara's press conference next day proved to be another of the misleading performances which mark his record all through the Vietnamese war. He spoke as if we were embarking on a minor support operation. He spoke of adding six additional combat battalions to the nine already in South Vietnam. He saw no need for new funds, new draft calls or industrial mobilization, though privately he is widely reported to have told Senators that 300,000 more men would be needed. He spoke as if South Vietnamese army morale were high; he even said there had been an increase in recruitment! Only when asked about desertions, did the truth begin to peep out. "It is somewhat less than last year," he said ingenuously, "but higher than desirable." Richard Starnes in the Washington *Daily News* that same day (June 16) was less squeamish when he reported desertions were "running at 20 to 35 percent every 90 days" and that "there is no more fight left in the army of South Vietnam." This is a major war on which we are embarking, but Johnson would still like us to slip into it, without noticing.

Under International Auspices

McNamara offered the peace movement a cue when he said at his press conference that our only objective was to give the people of South Vietnam a free choice of how they wish to be governed. If so, why not offer a cease-fire and a withdrawal of U.S. troops on condition of free elections in South Vietnam under international auspices? If we are fighting for this people's freedom, what more honorable way out than to allow them a free choice? Johnson may fear Republican criticism if he shifts back from Goldwaterism to negotiations. Those negotiations, if they are to be successful, must mean some kind of coalition regime in which the National Liberation Front will figure. The Republicans are already training their guns on such a solution. It would be harder for them to attack an outcome by free elections. Peace through free elections would provide a solid foundation of principle so far lacking in U.S. policy. It will not be easy to sell it to the other side since we cheated on the free elections we promised in 1954. They will hardly accept the promise again unless the U.S. withdraws its troops before the elections and lets some mutually acceptable international body oversee them. But here at least is an honorable way out, and a practical and simple slogan for the peace movement. If the ultimate purpose is freedom of choice for the people of South Vietnam, why kill more of them and more of our men before reaching it? Why not offer peace through free elections now?

Their Children and Ours

"'Country club living' and 'paradise' are scarcely the way you would expect someone to describe what it's like to live in Saigon in 1965. Yet that was the way it was according to a young woman who arrived this week from the Orient. She and her children went to the Philippines while her husband remained in Saigon. Of all of her husband's posts, life in Saigon was by far the most luxurious. 'We lived in a magnificent French mansion with excellent servants. Saigon went about its business although at night you could hear the mortar fire outside the city. Inside, there were beautiful shops, masses of bars and good restaurants.' American children were little affected. Christopher continued with the judo lessons he started in Africa. He and Karen studied piano and French and the little girl took ballet. Evacuation by order of the President was difficult to take. 'It was a great life while it lasted.'"

—San Francisco Chronicle Woman's Page (abr.), June 6.

"In what was left of Dong Xoai the story was the same as it is in all wars. Broken charred bodies of soldiers, the enemy, civilians, women and children were sprawled in the debris. Survivors wandered about looking for relatives and friends. Women held the dead bodies of babies. Children, wounded or burned, crouched or stumbled painfully through the wreckage of their homes."

—From Horst Faas's graphic account how Dong Xoai was retaken by our side after aerial and napalm bombardment, Associated Press, Washington Star, June 12.

We'll Be Glad to Send A Sample Copy of This Issue To A Friend — Send A Stamped Addressed Envelope

Why Not Send The Weekly As A Graduation Gift?

I. F. Stone's Weekly 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington, D. C. 20015

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

6/21/65

For the enclosed $5 send a gift sub to:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

For $5.35 extra send I. F. Stone's *The Haunted Fifties*

Indicate if announcement wished ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.

Washington, D. C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except the last week in December and the first week in January and Bi-Weekly during July and August at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED